arXiv:1207.7113v1 [math.FA] 30 Jul 2012

# The Bellman function of two variables for the dyadic maximal operator

A. Melas, E. Nikolidakis

**Abstract:** For $p > 1$ we find the Bellman function of two variables associated with the dyadic maximal operator on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Actually, we do that in the more general setting of tree-like maximal operators. We provide a simple and elementary proof, different from those in [3] and [5].

*Keywords*: Dyadic, Maximal, Bellman.

## 1. Introduction

The dyadic maximal operator on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a usefull tool in analysis and is defined by:

$$M_d\phi(x) = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q |\phi(u)|du : \ x \in Q, \ Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \text{ is a dyadic cube}\right\} \tag{1.1}$$

for every $\phi \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where the dyadic cubes are those formed by the grids $2^{-N}\mathbb{Z}^n$, for $N = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . It is well known that it satisfies the following weak type (1.1) inequality

$$\left|\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathcal{M}_d\phi(x) \geq \lambda\right\}\right| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_{\{\mathcal{M}_d\phi \geq \lambda\}} |\phi(u)|du, \tag{1.2}$$

for every $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and every $\lambda > 0$, from which it is easy to get the following $L^p$-inequality:

$$\|\mathcal{M}_d\phi\|_p \leq \frac{p}{p-1}\|\phi\|_p, \tag{1.3}$$

for every $p > 1$ and every $\phi \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

It is easy to see that (1.2) is best possible. It has also been proved that (1.3) is best possible see [1] and [2] for general martingales and [14] for dyadic ones).

In studying dyadic maximal operators it would be convenient to work on functions defined on $[0, 1]^n$ and more generally on a non-atomic probability measure space $(X, \mu)$ equipped with a tree $\mathcal{T}$, associated to it, the maximal operator $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}$ is defined.

Then (1.2) and (1.3) remain true and sharp in this setting.

An approach for studying such maximal operators is the introduction of the so called Bellman functions (see [5]) related to them.

The main Bellman function of two variables is defined by:

$$B_p(f,F) = \sup\left\{ \int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu : \ \phi \geq 0, \int_X \phi d\mu = f, \int_X \phi^p d\mu = F \right\} \tag{1.4}$$

for $0 < f^p \leq F$, which was firstly computed in [4], and proved to be independent of the structure of $\mathcal{T}$ and the measure space $(X,\mu)$.

There are several problems in Harmonic Analysis where Bellman functions naturally arise. Such problems (including the dyadic Carleson imbedding Theorem and weighted inequalities) are described in [7] (see also [5], [6]) and also connection to Stochastic Optimal Control are provided, from which it follows that the corresponding Bellman functions satisfy certain nonlinear second-order PDEs.

The exact computation of a Bellman functions is a difficult task which is connected with the deeper structure of the corresponding Harmonic Analysis problem. Thus far several Bellman functions have been computed (see [1], [3], [4], [8], [10], [11], [12], [13]).

In [4], it is proved that $B_p(f,F) = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p$, where $\omega_p : [0,1] \to \left[1, \frac{p}{p-1}\right]$, is the inverse function of $H_p$ defined for $z \in \left[1, \frac{p}{p-1}\right]$ by $H_p(z) = -(p-1)z^p + pz^{p-1}$.

The difficult part of this proof is to show that the above function is in fact an upper bound of the Bellman function given in (1.4).

Another approach has also been given in [9] where the Bellman function comes as a solution of a certain differential equation.

It seems now that there exists a simpler proof of the above mentioned fact which depends only on (1.1).

In fact we are able to show the following.

**Theorem 1.** *Let $p > 1$, $0 < f^p \leq F$. Then for every $\phi \in L^p(X,\mu)$ such that $\phi \geq 0$, $\int\limits_X \phi d\mu = f$, $\int\limits_X \phi^p d\mu = F$ the following holds*

$$\int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu \leq F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p. \quad \blacksquare$$

## 2. Main definitions and proof of Theorem 1

Let $(X,\mu)$ be a non-atomic probability measure space. We give the following.

**Definition 1.** *A set $\mathcal{T}$ of measurable subsets of $X$ will be called a tree if the following conditions hold* *i)* $X \in \mathcal{T}$ *and for every* $I \in \mathcal{T}$ *we have* $\mu(I) > 0$.

*ii)* *For every* $I \in \mathcal{T}$ *there corresponds a finite or countable subset* $C(I) \subset \mathcal{T}$, *containing at least two elements such that*

  *(a)* *The elements of* $C(I)$ *are pairwise disjoint subsets of* $I$.

  *(b)* $I = \cup C(I)$.

*iii)* $\mathcal{T} = \bigcup\limits_{m \geq 0} \mathcal{T}_{(m)}$, *where* $\mathcal{T}_{(0)} = \{X\}$ *and*

$$\mathcal{T}_{(m+1)} = \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{T}_{(m)}} C(I).$$

*iv)* *We have that* $\lim\limits_{m \to \infty} \sup \mu(I) = 0$. ■

**Definition 2.** *Given a non-atomic probability measure space* $(X, \mu)$ *and a tree* $\mathcal{T}$ *on* $X$, *we set for every* $\phi \in L^1(X, \mu)$,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi(x) = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{\mu(I)}\int_I |\phi| d\mu : \ x \in I \in \mathcal{T}\right\}. \quad ■$$

*As it is mentioned before (1.2) and (1.3) remain true for* $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}$ *as defined by. That is*

$$\mu(\{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi \geq \lambda\}) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_{\{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi \geq \lambda\}} |\phi| d\mu, \tag{2.1}$$

*for every* $\phi \in L^1(X, \mu)$ *and,*

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi\|_p \leq \frac{p}{p-1}\|\phi\|_p, \tag{2.2}$$

*for every* $\phi \in L^p(X, \mu)$.

We now proceed to:

**Proof of Theorem 1:** We have that

$$\int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu = \int_{\lambda=0}^{+\infty} p\lambda^{p-1}\mu(\{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi \geq \lambda\})d\lambda = \qquad \text{(since } \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi \geq f \text{ on } X)$$
$$= f^p + \int_{\lambda=f}^{+\infty} p\lambda^{p-1}\mu(\{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi \geq \lambda\})d\lambda.$$

From (2.1) we have now that:

$$\int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu \leq f^p + \int_{\lambda=f}^{+\infty} p\lambda^{p-2}\Big(\int_{\{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi \geq \lambda\}} \phi(x) d\mu(x)\Big) d\lambda.$$

A use now of Fubini theorem gives (since $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi(x) \geq f$, for every $x \in X$)

$$\begin{aligned}\int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu &\leq f^p + p\int_X \phi(x)\big(\int_{\lambda=f}^{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi(x)} \lambda^{p-2} d\lambda\big) d\mu(x) \\ &= f^p + \frac{p}{p-1}\int_X \phi(x)\big([\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi(x)]^{p-1} - f^{p-1}\big) d\mu(x) \\ &= -\frac{1}{p-1}f^p + \frac{p}{p-1}\int_X \phi(x)[\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi(x)]^{p-1} d\mu(x),\end{aligned}$$

which in view of Holder's inequality shows that:

$$\int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu \leq -\frac{1}{p-1}f^p + \frac{p}{p-1}\Big(\int_X \phi^p\Big)^{1/p} \cdot \Big(\int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu\Big)^{p-1/p}. \tag{2.3}$$

If we set $I = \int\limits_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu$, we obviously have, upon dividing both sides of (2.3) with $F$, that

$$H_p(w) = -(p-1)w^p + pw^{p-1} \geq \frac{f^p}{F}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $w = \left(\frac{I}{F}\right)^{1/p}$.

But $H_p$ is strictly decreasing on $\left[1, \frac{p}{p-1}\right]$. Since $w \in \left[1, \frac{p}{p-1}\right]$ by (2.2) (if $w < 1$ we have nothing to prove), we immediately obtain that $w \leq \omega_p(f^p/F)$ or that $I \leq F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p$ which is the desired result. ■

# References

[1] D. L. Burkholder, Martingales and Fourier Analysis in Banach spaces, C.I.M.E. Lectures Curenna, Como, Italy, 1985, *Lecture Notes Math* **1206** (1986) 61-108.

[2] D. L. Burkholder, Explorations in martingale theory and its applications, École d' Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX-1989, *Lecture Notes Math* **1464** (1991) 1-66.

[3] D. L. Burkholder, Boundary value problems and sharp inequalities for martingale transforms, *Ann. of Prob.* **12** (1984), 647-702.

[4] A. Melas, The Bellman functions of dyadic-like maximal operators and related inequalities: *Adv. in Math.* 310-340.

[5] F. Nazarov, S. Treil, The hunt for a Bellman function: Applications to estimates for singular integral (operators and to other classical problems of Harmonic Analysis, *Algebra i Analyz* **8** (5) (1996) 32-162.

[6] F. Nazarov, S. Treil, A. Volberg, The Bellman functions and two-weight inequalities for Haar multipliers. *Journ. Amer. Math. Soc.* **12** no. 4 (1999), 909-928.

[7] F. Nazarov, S. Treil, A. Volberg, Bellman function in Stochastic Optimal Control and Harmonic Analysis (how our Bellman function got its name), *Oper. Theory: Advances and Appl.* **129** (2001), 393-424, Birkhäuser Verlag.

[8] L. Slavin, V. Vasyunin, Sharp results in the integral-form John-Nirenberg inequality.

[9] L. Slavin, A. Stokolos, V. Vasyunin, Monge-Ampére equations and Bellman functions: The dyadic maximal operator, *C. R. Acad. Paris Sér. I Math.* **346** (9-10) (2008) 585-588.

[10] L. Slavin, A. Volberg, The explicit BF for a dyadic Chang-Wilson-Wolff theorem. The $s$-function and the exponential integral. *Contmp. Math.* 444, *Amer. Math. Soc.* Providence, RI, 2007, MR 2423630.

[11] V. Vasyunin. The sharp constant in the reverse Holder inequality for Muckenhoupt weights. *Algebra i Analiz*, **15** (2003), no. 1, 73-117.

[12] V. Vasyunin, A. Volberg. The Bellman functions for a certain two weight inequality: the case study. *Algebra i Analiz*, **18** (2006), No. 2.

[13] V. Vasyunin, A. Volberg. Monge-Ampère equation and Bellman optimization of Carleson embedding Theorem. *Linear and Complex Analysis* 195238, *Amer. Math. Soc.* Transl. Ser 2, **226**, *Amer. Math. Soc.*, Providence, RI 2009.

[14] G. Wang, Sharp maximal inequalities for conditionally symmetric martingales and Brownian motion, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **112** (1991) 579-586.

**A. Melas:** Department of Mathematics

University of Athens,

GR-15784 Panepistimioupolis,

Athens, Greece

E-mail address: amelas@math.uoa.gr

**E. Nikolidakis:** Department of Mathematics

University of Crete,

Heraclion 71409, Crete, Greece

E-mail address: lefteris@math.uoc.gr